DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 679 HE 026 426

AUTHOR	McCarthy, JoAnn S.
TITLE	Mobilizing Faculty for International Education: The Mini Exchange. Occasional Papers on International Exchange. Forum Series 29.
INSTITUTION	Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-882036-13-1
PUB DATE	Nov 92
NOTE	32p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council on International Educational Exchange, 205 East 42nd St., New York, NY 10017 (free).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Higher Education; Intercollegiate Cooperation; *International Educational Exchange; International Programs; Program Administration; Program Development; *Teacher Exchange Programs

ABSTRACT

This publication describes a type of small-scale college or university faculty exchange format designed to introduce more faculty to international professional activity. The "mini-exchange" is a short-term, low-cost, entry-level experience which provides an attractive faculty development option that can have significant impact on efforts to internationalize the higher education curriculum. Opening sections detail the importance of international exchange for higher education faculty and such barriers to participation as lack of overseas identification, lack of time, lack of financial support, lack of administrative support, lack of language ability, lack of contacts, and conditions abroad that may be perceived or threatening. The central section describes the faculty mini-exchange, which is a short term exchange of a group of faculty members (typically 5 to 10 professors) between two cooperating institutions. The duration of the exchange is a 2-week period at the institution abroad followed by hosting one's counterpart for a 2-week visit to the home institution at a later date. This section describes managing a mini-exchange including identifying an institution, setting objectives, focusing a clientele, setting dates, developing a budget, financing, application and selection procedures, program development, orientation, evaluation, and post-exchange support. An appendix lists other occasional papers on international educational exchange. (Contains 6 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED357679

OCCASIONAL PAPERS 29

On International Educational Exchange

Mobilizing Faculty for International Education: The Mini-Exchange

By JoAnn S. McCarthy

HE 026 426

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CIEE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Council on International Educational Exchange

The Council on International Educational Exchange is a nonprofit, educational organization, incorporated in the United States with international offices, affiliations, and representation. CIEE, founded in 1947 by a small group of organizations active in international education and student travel, was established to restore student exchange after World War II. In its early years CIEE chartered ocean liners for transatlantic student sailings, arranged group air travel, and organized orientation programs to prepare students and teachers for educational experiences abroad. Over the years CIEE's mandate has broadened dramatically and its activities and programs abroad have spread beyond Europe to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Today CIEE develops and administers a wide variety of study, work, and travel programs for students at the secondary, undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mobilizing Faculty for International Education: The Mini-Exchange

by

JoAnn S. McCarthy

November 1992

Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017

Copyright © 1992
by the Council on International Educational Exchange
ISBN: 1-882036-13-1

Table of Contents

Abstract v

About the Author vii

Preface ix

Faculty and International Education 1
Profiles of Active and Inactive Faculty

Obstacles to Participation 5

The Faculty Mini-Exchange 9
Definition and Rational
Managing a Mini-Exchange

Conclusions 17

References 19

Appendix:
Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange 21

Abstract

The current emphasis on internationalizing U.S. higher education is largely dependent upon mobilizing faculty to carry out this important agenda. Creative new models for facilitating the international movement of faculty are required to expand the number of faculty who have international professional experience. The faculty mini-exchange responds to this need for introducing more faculty to international professional activity, thereby adding a global dimension to their subsequent research and teaching. The mini-exchange eliminates many of the barriers that currently prevent widespread faculty participation. As a short-term, low-cost, entry-level experience, the mini-exchange provides an attractive faculty development option that can have significant impact on efforts to internationalize the higher education curriculum throughout the U.S.

About the Author

JoAnn McCarthy is the Executive Director of International Programs for Old Dominion University. Previously, she was the Director of International Studies and Programs at Illinois State University, where she worked from 1983 to 1992. She has also served as Executive Director for the Illinois Consortium for International Studies and Programs, working to promote study abroad and faculty development for community colleges.

Preface

Since 1984, Illinois State University (ISU) has been actively involved in an institution-wide effort to internationalize the institution. This effort focused on faculty development, curriculum development, the expansion of study-abroad programs, and enhancement of foreign student and faculty services.

In 1985, ISU began experimenting with faculty mini-exchanges in conjunction with partner institutions abroad in order to encourage more faculty to participate in a wide array of international activities. In just a few years, faculty have visited and hosted counterparts from England, Germany, Japan, Thailand, Russia, China, and Australia. Literally hundreds of faculty from ISU and partner institutions have developed beneficial professional relationships that have led to joint research, sabbatical leaves, funded projects, publications, short-term teaching assignments, and consulting opportunities around the world. It may be no coincidence that study-abroad participation, foreign student enrollments, and new international course offerings on campus have continued to increase in recent years, as well.

The mini-exchange is offered as one model for faculty development in international education that responds to the urgent need to internationalize U.S. colleges and universities while accommodating the realities of modern academia with its lack of flexibility and dearth of resources.

Faculty and International Education

The events of the past decade have transformed the world at a breathtaking pace. The reconfiguration of Europe, the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the rapid transmission of diseases on a global scale, the deterioration of the environment, the growth of refugee problems, and the emergence of economic competition from the Pacific Rim, plus the North American Alliance, and the European Community are only a few of the compelling issues of our time.

As we approach the year 2000, educators everywhere are challenged to keep pace with these changes that have such profound implications for our collective future. Throughout the U.S., more and more institutions are reexamining curricula that appear to be relics of the 1950s and 1960s. Institutions are now struggling to develop their international/global dimensions in response to these sweeping political, economic, and social changes. Although some disciplines have accepted more responsibility than others for responding to these new realities, no area of study in the curriculum can escape the need for reexamination.

More than 20 years ago, when the movement to internationalize higher education was in its infancy, Sanders and Ward (1970) pointed out a basic truth:

> In the last analysis, a college or university will make real progress in broadening the international component of its educational effort only to the extent that a substantial number of individual faculty members feel a responsibility to do so and are prepared to act upon it (p. 230).

In 1991, Henson, Noel, Gillard-Byers and Ingle underscored the pivotal role of faculty with data from a nationwide study of U.S. universities. The study pointed out that the highly internationalized universities in the U.S. "...made explicit efforts and provided resources for faculty international competence development" (p. 8). This support is demonstrated in a variety of forms, but the

provision of opportunities to gain experience abroad was deemed very important.

Faculty control the curriculum; they also control the content of courses. They influence students by what they include, what they exclude, and the manner in which they present ideas and concepts. A professor who lacks appreciation for the international perspective of his or her discipline cannot be expected to impart such appreciation to students. Therefore, the foundation of any major effort to internationalize must begin with a broadly based faculty development effort. Even highly internationalized institutions might have faculty who, for some reason or another, are not active internationally. Thus, faculty development efforts can benefit virtually any institution that is trying to strengthen its international dimension.

Maurice Harari (1987) estimates that "a critical mass of 10 to 15 percent of the faculty is sufficient to carry forward the movement to internationalize the institution" (p. 5). He also supports the international exchange of professors as an effective means of developing the international skills of faculty, especially when such exchanges "[reinforce] the goals and priorities of a carefully planned curriculum" (p. 6). Barbara Burn (1990) concurs, while at the same time recognizing the difficulty in substantially increasing the number of faculty involved in traditional exchanges that may involve an absence of six months or more from the home campus.

> "In encouraging more American faculty to spend time abroad for professional reasons in the coming decade as a vehicle for international education, relatively brief sojourns should be facilitated and supported even if they involve less cultural broadening and acquaintance with the host country and culture than do longer periods" (p. 38).

Craufurd Goodwin and Michael Nacht (1991) state categorically that "scholarly experience abroad is the best route in the short run by which U.S. higher education can prepare itself to respond positively to the current challenge to internationalize" (p. 117). In their landmark examination of American faculty activity abroad, *Missing the Boat: The Failure to Internationalize American Higher Education*, they found that there was much room for expansion and improvement.

Profiles of Active and Inactive Faculty

Goodwin and Nacht examined which faculty were most likely to pursue overseas activity and which faculty tend to avoid such experiences. In summary, active faculty often include:

1. Area studies specialists
2. Study-abroad directors from a broad range of disciplines

3. Development assistance specialists (i.e. agriculture, engineering, education)
4. Specialists in "international" disciplines (i.e. linguistics, literature, architecture, art history, archeology)
5. Scientists (often engaged in field work, collaborative research, or needing access to special scientific instruments)

On the other hand, faculty who tend to avoid international experiences include:

1. Academic ethnocentrists who believe all worthwhile work is being carried out in the U.S.
2. Laboratory-bound scientists involved in long-term, team-oriented research
3. Methodologically sophisticated social scientists who dismiss human cultural variations as immaterial to their analysis of quantifiable data.
4. Some recent immigrants whose professional (and perhaps personal) allegiance has shifted to the U.S.
5. The "timid and the meek" who find the effort and the costs of participation too daunting.
6. Domestically–oriented applied disciplines including law and, to some extent, medicine (pp. 11-36)

Highly motivated and resourceful faculty who do go overseas may go under the auspices of the Fulbright program or other publicly or privately sponsored programs. Others devise foreign teaching or research assignments in conjunction with a planned sabbatical leave. Still others use the summer hiatus to immerse themselves in overseas experiences. Geographic destinations range from Greenland to Tierra del Fuego and from London to Jakarta. However, many academic voyagers still tend to gravitate to Europe and to the countries where English is an accepted means of communication.

Obstacles to Participation

There are significant difficulties associated with faculty participation in traditional activities overseas, and these must be addressed if more faculty are to join the ranks of internationally active academics.

Lack of identification with overseas activity

Many faculty have never traveled abroad, at least not professionally. They do not see themselves as international "actors," so they define themselves in more parochial terms. Breaching this negative mind-set is often a function of mentoring. Faculty must be made aware of opportunities to become internationally involved. Faculty inexperienced in this area need non-threatening initial experiences to introduce them to the various international possibilities that await them as they develop their academic careers. Novices are sometimes ill at ease as they observe the so-called "jet set" faculty and conclude that they are ill-prepared to compete. This attitude is sometimes reaffirmed by seasoned international faculty with territorial tendencies who may discourage new players as "dilettantes." This lack of identification with international activity is particularly prevalent in disciplines not normally considered international in nature, although it certainly can be found in any academic department on campus.

Lack of time

Very few faculty are personally or professionally able to move to the other side of the globe for significant periods of time without serious planning and sacrifice. Family obligations (working spouses, school-age children), inflexible teaching assignments on campus, ongoing research, and the scarcity of sabbatical or other paid leaves of absence all combine to virtually eliminate the overseas semester or year for large numbers of faculty. Windows of opportunity are often confined to vacation periods or short leaves that faculty colleagues are willing and able to "cover."

Lack of Financial Support

Inevitably, activities abroad require additional resources. Depending on the length of the stay, accompanying dependents, the cost of living in the host country, and a multitude of incidental expenses, activities abroad can be extraordinarily expensive. Given the financial straits of higher education in the U.S., it comes as no surprise that institutions have few if any resources to devote to financing academic endeavors abroad. External resources are highly competitive, often narrowly focused, and cannot begin to meet the growing demand for support from faculty who wish to pursue international experiences.

Lack of administrative support

Rules and regulations often combine to form compelling disincentives for overseas activities. In terms of career development, Goodwin and Nacht point out that "...no point in an academic career is just right for an international experience" (1991, p. 69). The regulations for sabbatical leaves, the changing priorities of institutions, inflexible teaching assignments, and evaluation criteria for promotion and tenure frustrate many faculty who would pursue an international assignment otherwise.

Lack of language ability

The legendary linguistic incompetence of Americans is frequently a problem among academics in higher education. Relatively few faculty are able to conduct research and/or lecture in a second language, which limits their opportunities abroad.

Lack of contacts

Many faculty are thwarted in their desire for an overseas academic experience because they lack personal contacts in foreign institutions that can lead to opportunities to teach, engage in research, or consult.

Conditions abroad

Many faculty find social, political, or economic conditions abroad to be threatening. This is often due to a lack of information and experience. Media reports of unrest often take on unrealistic proportions, and the perceived dangers of living in a particular country are sometimes exaggerated to the point of discouraging faculty activity there.

Given the previously mentioned obstacles to participating in activities abroad, it is not surprising that large numbers of faculty never get involved. In order to significantly increase the number of faculty nationwide who will become strong advocates for internationalization, one must address the needs of those who have not yet become active. Institutions must provide opportunities for academic ethonocentrists to become enlightened about the nature

and value of academic endeavors abroad. The uninitiated must have access to introductory experiences that can launch them on a lifelong pursuit of the international dimension of their disciplines. Faculty from nontraditional disciplines must be able to find their counterparts in the broader context of international higher education so that they too can expand their academic horizons. All of this must be done within a short time frame, at little or no institutional cost, with the blessing of academic administrators, and preferably this can be accomplished in English.

In recent years, some colleges and universities have been searching for ways to provide faculty with more opportunities for experiences abroad. In addition to providing assistance for the more traditional semester-long sabbatical leave abroad, institutions are beginning to experiment with more creative responses. For example, at Purdue University faculty are encouraged to develop reciprocal exchanges with partner colleges or departments overseas. Simultaneous swapping of teaching assignments with participants retaining their home institution salaries has eliminated the need for sabbatical funding for these exchanges. The university has also funded short-term exchanges for approximately one month by subsidizing travel and living expenses in hopes of encouraging longer-term relationships with a targeted institution. Purdue also encourages exchanges with linkage partners by counting time spent overseas in such arrangements as accrued time for both retirement and sabbatical leaves. Finally, Purdue has set aside $100,000 per year for five years for Global Initiative Grants. Half of that allocation has been used as seed money to foster faculty and student exchanges. Disbursed in amounts of $2,500, these grants can go a long way toward developing faculty expertise and contacts with counterparts abroad, perhaps leading to significant expansion of activities in the future.

Other institutions have sought external funding to support short-term faculty exchanges. Under the broad umbrella of the Fulbright Program, colleges and universities have taken advantage of the University Affiliations Program (administered by the United States Information Agency); Title VI Grants (administered by the U.S. Department of Education); and Group Projects Abroad (U.S. Department of Education), among others. More recently, the Agency for International Development has initiated its University Development Linkages Projects which can provide funds for faculty exchanges and other international activities. A wide variety of public and private, foreign and domestic organizations support faculty exchanges in a broad range of disciplines, but competition for these funds grows more intense every year. Institutions interested in such sources of support should consult the *International Studies Funding and Resources Book* (1990) or a similar guide for detailed information indexed by funding source, geographic region, and field of study.

In searching for overseas professional development opportunities for faculty, some institutions have taken advantage of seminars offered by international consortia and other nonprofit organizations such as the College Consortium for International Studies (CCIS) and the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE). CCIS sponsors one-week professional development seminars in a variety of foreign countries that are intended to promote the internationalization of American higher education. CIEE also offers a series of one- to two-week programs on multidisciplinary themes of current interest to academics. For example recent seminar topics have included such diverse subjects as the African-American experience in the U.S.; Northern Ireland as a divided society; historical perspectives of Vietnam; the redemocratization of Chile; and the reunification of Germany. CIEE strongly encourages institutions to subsidize the cost of faculty participation, and in 1991–92, 77 percent of the participants had 50 to 100 percent of their financial costs shared by their home institution.

The Faculty Mini-Exchange

Definition and Rational

In response to the need for broad-based faculty development opportunities for international education, the faculty mini-exchange is offered as one possible vehicle for significant institutional impact. A mini-exchange is simply a short-term exchange of a group of faculty (typically five to 10 professors) between two cooperating institutions. The duration of the exchange described here is a two-week period at the institution abroad followed by hosting one's counterpart for a two-week visit to the home institution at a later date. In all, the participants spend a total of one month together—two weeks on each campus. Obviously, other time frames could be established if they seem more appropriate for participants and/or objectives.

The general purposes of such an exchange include

1. To provide an opportunity to "internationalize" the faculty of both institutions

2. To strengthen the ties between the two institutions through investigation of new ways to collaborate for mutual benefit

3. To provide a means for faculty renewal and development, which can energize research, teaching, and consulting activity

4. To provide incentive and support for curriculum development

5. To attract students from abroad to the U.S. institution

6. To increase U.S. student participation in study abroad through broader faculty support

7. To expose students and faculty at the host institution to American professors and exposing American students and faculty on the home campus to professors from abroad

8. To introduce participating professors to opportunities for subsequent international activities for continued professional growth

9. To accomplish specific objectives of importance to both institutions

Managing a Mini-Exchange

Although, on the surface, a mini-exchange may appear to be a simple, straightforward activity, there are a number of important steps and considerations that need to be addressed. Exchanges of this type normally require six months to a year of planning and preparation prior to the first group's departure, and one person on each campus must be designated as the responsible party for managing the following tasks:

Identifying a partner institution

Ideally, one should start by surveying existing institutional partners with whom one is already at least somewhat familiar. Potential exchange managers at both institutions should be able to work well together, and communication between the two should be accomplished with ease. There should be general acceptance by both sides that such an exchange would be of significant benefit, and the exchange should have the unqualified support of key administrators. Both managers should be relatively certain that enough faculty interest could be generated and sufficient resources identified to successfully proceed with the exchange.

This is, of course, the time to confront the language problem head-on. Practically speaking, all participants from the foreign institution must be minimally proficient in English. Regrettably such foreign language requirements are not realistically possible for most American faculty, so one must often rely on the ability of the partner institution to bridge the language gap. Fortunately, this does not necessarily create an insurmountable problem. On the other hand, if the American faculty has adequate competence in the target language, the possibility increases significantly for a more interactive and valuable exchange on both sides.

Setting the objectives

Once it is agreed in principle that a mini-exchange could further the general aims of both institutions, one must define specific objectives: Do you want to increase each other's general knowledge of programs and personnel on each campus for subsequent development? Do you want to get more of the science (fine arts? education?) faculty involved in international activities? Is it important to explore compatibility of your respective business programs? Do you want to

investigate the feasibility of student teaching or internships? Do you want to increase faculty support of student exchange programs?

It is very important to focus on one or more specific objectives at this stage in order to define who will participate and how to develop the actual program. This is a critical point of negotiation between the two institutions and may well determine the ultimate success or failure of the program.

Focusing on a clientele

Once objectives have been set, it is important to identify potential participants who will optimize the effects of the exchange. One should consider depth and breadth of representation among the faculty with consideration given to future plans for development. How many should go? How many can you afford to send? Is the department chair or dean a key player and potential participant? What logistical problems are presented by this particular group? Does this activity fit in with their own established academic goals and objectives?

Setting the dates

The dates of both sides of the exchange should be set well enough in advance to allow for adequate planning by the managers, participating departments, and individual participants. One must allow time for participant selection, orientation, and program development. Sufficient thime should be allotted to generate funding, whether it be through an institution's or department's budgeting or from outside sources such as foundations and grants. The actual dates should be negotiated for times when faculty absence is least disruptive on the home campus and when their presence on the host campus can be productive. In other words, visits should not be hosted during exam periods, vacation time, or the first week of any academic term. Likewise, it will be difficult to allow faculty to be absent from campus during critical times, so plan accordingly. With the very different academic calendars exhibited worldwide, it is usually not difficult to identify appropriate times for the two phases of the exchange. Be specific about starting and ending dates, especially with regard to weekends, so that there are no misunderstandings on either side. Generally, mini-exchanges are scheduled for 10–14 days on each site.

Developing a budget

The fundamental principle of the mini-exchange is to provide a useful experience abroad at the lowest possible cost to the institution and participant. Therefore, one should go to extraordinary lengths to eliminate unnecessary costs and spread the essential costs across the broadest spectrum of "shareholders" as possible. Essential costs to be covered by the U.S. institution and/or participant include:

1. Airport transportation to and from the city of departure for outgoing faculty
2. International airfare to the airport nearest the institution abroad
3. Program costs for *incoming* faculty from abroad including:
   - Airport transportation from arrival city to the U.S. institution
   - Room and board for foreign faculty at the U.S. institution
   - Local transportation
   - Local sightseeing
   - Official receptions/dinners
   - Insurance if foreign participants are unable to provide their own coverage (especially necessary for countries with nonconvertible currencies).

Since the primary purpose of the exchange is academic, there is no obligation nor expectation to provide expensive sightseeing options. Focusing on the development of personal and professional relationships has its own unique rewards, and warm hospitality (both on and off campus) more than substitutes for the lack of the usual activities one tends to associate with overseas travel. The mini-exchange is a professional and cultural opportunity that cannot be replicated in any kind of tour. Participants quickly realize this fact and do not feel slighted if they never really see the nearest metropolis.

To determine the cost, the hosting of the visiting delegation is prorated across the number of U.S. participants (the costs of housing, transportation, receptions, etc.) and then the price of the participants' transportation is added. Obviously, the closer one can stay to the cost of airfare, the easier the program will be to finance on both sides of the exchange.

Financing the program

One way that participant costs can be significantly reduced is by in-kind contributions of meals and housing. Costs can be cut drastically if the participating faculty agree to host their counterparts in their own homes for the two-week period or find alternative no-cost meals and housing if one's own home is not feasible. Some universities have accommodations for visiting faculty that may make such arrangements unnecessary. Others may have space available in residence halls, in married student housing, or with volunteer families in the community. Meals are the responsibility of the host institution for the two-week period and are often a combination of meals taken with the family, in residence hall cafeterias, or hosted by other colleagues in the department during the course of the visitor's stay.

Generally, participants are expected to focus on their professional development objectives during this brief exchange. Therefore, spouses and other family members who wish to share the experience are asked to wait until the end of the program to make personal travel plans. Equally important is the fact that additional family members can pose a significant burden on both the time and resources of host families and institutions. Therefore, the presence of family members during the actual exchange is strongly discouraged.

In addition to housing, other aspects of the program may be subsidized and shared by a variety of fiscal units across the institution without serious difficulty. The university president's office might host a welcome reception. University vehicles or private cars and vans may be used for local transportation and airport transfers. Tickets for plays, concerts, and athletic events could be donated by sponsors within the university or from the surrounding community. Matching funds from participants, departments, colleges, international studies offices, research offices, and other sponsors can whittle away the costs to a level affordable by even the most financially strapped junior faculty member.

Application and selection procedures

Faculty should be made aware of a mini-exchange opportunity as soon as full details are available and all administrative approvals are confirmed. An information letter explaining the nature of the exchange, dates, costs, eligibility requirements, application procedures, and deadlines should be sent to all qualified faculty. A three- to five-person committee of appropriate faculty may be assembled to review applications, which should meet a predetermined criteria for selection. At a minimum, the application announcement should request the following:

1. A brief summary of the reasons for wanting to participate
2. An estimation of the candidate's potential for impact on the curriculum as a result of participation
3. A statement of commitment to attend a set number of hours of orientation prior to departure (often 5 to 10 hours, depending on the destination)
4. If participants are expected to provide local accommodations and meals for an exchange counterpart, they should indicate that they understand this obligation as part of the terms of participation
5. A summary of any previous academic interest and/or experience in the host county
6. A commitment to provide a summary report of the exchange by a specified deadline after completion, noting how new knowledge,

contacts and materials will ultimately be incorporated into the curriculum or how other specific program objectives will be met. (Copies of this report should be forwarded to department chairs, deans and provost.)

7. A cover sheet with signatures of the department chair and dean, approving participation if selected. This sign-off feature precludes any surprises for line administrators who were counting on a faculty member's presence for whatever reason during the time of the exchange. Departments also share the burden of hosting foreign faculty, so they must be informed and be willing to cooperate.

Selections should be made as soon as possible after the deadline for applications. All applicants should be apprised of the outcome, and the chosen candidates should be invited to an informational meeting as soon as one can be scheduled. At that time, an orientation schedule can be determined, specific questions can be answered, and complete curricula vitae can be collected. The curricula vitae can then be forwarded to the host campus to assist the manager there in matching exchange partners and designing the program for the American professors. Similar materials with regard to the professors abroad should be sent to the U.S. institution as soon as they are available.

Program development

Once both managers know the specific backgrounds, resources, and interests of the participating professors, planning the program can begin. There are usually two levels of planning: general and specific. The exchange manager takes responsibility for planning general group activities, while individual participants plan a more specific itinerary for their guests. At a minimum, the exchange manager should oversee the following activities:

1. Group arrival and departure plans
2. Greeting and orientation
3. Official receptions, campus tours, or group meetings
4. Group sightseeing or social events

These events of a group nature should be scheduled first. At this point, unencumbered time on the itinerary is then free to be scheduled by the host faculty member. These individualized activities often include the following:

1. Guest lectures to faculty and/or students
2. Attendance at department meetings
3. Visits with key faculty and administrators

4. Visits to local/regional cooperating agencies, institutions, or businesses
5. Sightseeing or social events

Participating faculty are encouraged to share their guest with as many colleagues as possible in order to maximize the impact of his or her brief stay. Generally, faculty are very creative in filling out the visitor's itinerary; however, hosts sometimes tend to over-commit their guest's time and energies and should be cautioned to leave some free time.

Orientation

Regardless of how familiar the destination may seem, faculty need thorough orientation before participating in a mini-exchange. One should treat a mini-exchange group as one would any study-abroad program. One must assume that some participants will have limited travel experience and limited knowledge of the host country.

Without insulting anyone's intelligence, it is very important to provide participants with some basic knowledge of current political, social, and economic conditions in the target area. They should know something about the community, the institution, and the general design of education in the host country.

If the culture or living conditions are significantly different than in the U.S., substantial time should be dedicated to imparting such crucial information to participants. Participants are invariably more flexible, accommodating, and accepting if they have been prepared in advance for situations that require adaptation. Leaving such knowledge to chance or counting on the goodwill of all parties to surmount difficulties is an unnecessary risk that could jeopardize the success of the exchange. Take this opportunity to use faculty or students from the host country to help provide orientation. Rely on U.S. faculty who are familiar with the target country to prepare the faculty to represent the institution well while abroad.

Finally, provide faculty with the names, addresses, and phone numbers of their counterparts as early as possible so that they can establish contact prior to departure. This preliminary personal contact allows for better planning of itineraries and allays the participants' feelings of dealing with a "total stranger."

Evaluating the exchange

Exchanges should be evaluated on several levels. First, from a logistical point of view, what could be done to improve the exchange, both in the U.S. and abroad? Second, from a programmatic point of view, did the exchange accomplish its goals? Participants at both ends should file summary reports for the exchange manager, their respective department chairs, and deans. The ex-

change manager should summarize the accomplishments of the exchange for central administration and other interested parties. Finally, the exchange managers should provide each other with summaries of the exchange, noting areas of success needing follow-up as well as aspects that need improvement if subsequent exchanges are planned for the future.

Post-exchange support

If the mini-exchange is to be a catalyst for future faculty activity of an international nature, post-exchange support is a critical factor. Upon their return, faculty are at the height of their enthusiasm and energy, often filled with ideas for future endeavors. At this important juncture, they can be brought into the international network on campus as permanent players in a variety of ways:

1. Provide recognition for their recent accomplishments. Publicize their participation in the exchange. Suggest ways for them to share their experience with colleagues, student clubs, and community groups.
2. Add them to the mailing list for all international activities on campus. Let them know you are counting on them to help internationalize the institution.
3. Invite them to join area studies teams on campus that foster curriculum development in the geographic area just experienced. Help them identify and network with other faculty who have similar foreign experiences and interests.
4. Invite them to attend workshops on campus or inform them of conferences and workshops off campus that will further develop their international network and expertise.
5. Alert them to sources of funding for international activities. Introduce them to other faculty on campus who have been successful in attracting funding for international ventures.
6. Keep them informed. Enlist their help whenever possible. Keep them active with students from the country or region they visited. Appoint them to committees that will benefit from their newly developed enthusiasm and expertise. In other words, make every effort to include them in the ranks of "international faculty."

Conclusions

For many years, academics looked upon international activities as the preserve of a select few who could reasonably justify such global wanderings. For many, international experiences spanned six months to a year, often as a sabbatical leave. Abbreviated trips abroad were sometimes viewed with skepticism and often judged superficial or frivolous.

In recent years, international involvement of faculty in teaching, research, and consulting has become a desirable element across all disciplines as institutions seek to internationalize the curriculum. Unfortunately, the increased interest in overseas activity has coincided with a nearly universal recession in higher education. The resources needed to support such activities simply are not available.

The faculty mini-exchange can be used as an effective model for low cost, high impact faculty development in international education. Initial skepticism as well as charges of superficiality and "junketing" have been supplanted by general recognition that mini-exchanges can have a powerful impact upon one's professional growth and direction. A one-month program divided between the home campus and the overseas institution has been the catalyst for the development of a whole new cadre of faculty with international interest and experience at some institutions. Seasoned faculty have been rejuvenated by a fresh perspective on their respective disciplines. Younger faculty have discovered new and broader dimensions to explore throughout their developing academic careers. Even active scholars have discovered new geographic sites in which to pursue their academic growth.

New courses and new major fields are under development. Core curricula are being revamped to reflect a more global, interdisciplinary perspective. Foreign language requirements are being restored, and faculty are taking advantage of "crash" courses in foreign languages. Study-abroad participation has increased dramatically, and a tangible international ethos has been firmly

established on previously parochial university campuses. The faculty mini-exchanges can play an important role in developing the international dimension of a university in a short period of time. The simplicity of its design and its minimal demands upon scarce resources make it a viable model for nearly any type of institution that seeks to expand the international expertise and impact of its faculty.

References

Burn, B. (1990). *The Contribution of International Educational Exchange to the International Education of Americans: Projections for the Year 2000* (Occasional Paper 26). New York: Council on International Educational Exchange.

Goodwin, C. & Nacht, M. (1991). *Missing the Boat: The Failure to Internationalize American Higher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gutierrez, G. & Morehouse, W., eds. (1990). *International Studies Funding and Resource Book: Guide to Sources of Support for International Education*. New York: Apex Press.

Harari, M. (1987, May). *Internationalizing U.S. HigherEducation and the Case Study of the University of California, Long Beach*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, Long Beach, CA.

Henson, J., Noel J., Gillard-Byers, T., & Ingle, M.(1991). *Internationalizing U.S. Universities: A Preliminary Summary of a National Study*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University.

Sanders, I. & Ward, J. (1970). *Bridges to Understanding*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix: Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange

Editorial Board

Chair: Edwin A. Battle, Institute of International Education
Editor: Nelda S. Crowell, American Graduate School of International Management
Jon Booth, University of Minnesota
Barbara Burn, University of Massachusetts—Amherst
Stephen Cooper, Louisiana State University
William Cressey, Georgetown University
Jean Delaney,University of Colorado—Boulder
Joseph Hickey, Council on International Educational Exchange
Mary Peterson, NAFSA: Association of International Educators
Paula Spier, Antioch University
Henry Weaver, University of California

Guidelines for Submission of Papers

The Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange promulgate noteworthy scholarship and serve as a forum for the dissemination of provocative thinking in the field of international educational exchange. The papers address issues of interest to academics and professionals involved with a wide variety of activities on the field.

The Occasional Papers appear in two series:

- The **Research Series** makes available contributions to scholarly research in the field of international education; any competent research methodology—whether historical, analytical, or experimental—may serve as the basis of the research reported.
- The **Forum Series** focuses on contributions to the development of new or existing ideas in the field of international education; papers

may be texts of speeches, essays, or descriptions of projects, and should reflect the ideas or experiences of practitioners in international education.

Submission of Manuscripts

CIEE invites researchers and practitioners to submit manuscripts for possible publication as an Occasional Paper on International Educational Exchange in either the Forum or the Research Series. Manuscripts should follow these guidelines:

1. Two copies of a typed, double-spaced manuscript should be submitted. If return of the manuscript is requested, a stamped, self-addressed envelope must be included.
2. The manuscript should include a title page (with the name and address of the author, date of submission, and the number of pages submitted) and an abstract of no more than one page.
3. Manuscript pages should be numbered sequentially (excluding the title page). Numbering should include appendices and bibliography.
4. The length of the manuscript should generally be at least ten typed pages and no more than fifty pages.
5. The paper should be accompanied by appendices and a bibliography, as appropriate.
6. The manuscript should follow the basic style outlined in a recognized style book, such as the *Chicago Manual of Style*, *Modern Language Association Style Sheet*, or *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*.
7. The writer should indicate whether the document is available on diskette in a word processor format, giving specifics on the format.

Mail manuscript submissions to: Edwin A. Battle, Chair, CIEE Editorial Board, c/o Publications, Council on International Educational Exchange, 205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017.

Review and Selection Process

Members of CIEE's editorial board consider all submissions and make recommendations to the chair of that board. Ordinarily the author's identity is masked in the review process. Selected manuscripts usually undergo further revision by the author and by the editor. CIEE holds the copyright on published papers.

Previous Titles

Since 1965, the Council on International Educational Exchange has published 28 occasional papers on a variety of subjects in the field of international education:

1. *Problems in Relations with Foreign Universities* by Stephen A. Freeman (1965)
2. *The Overseas Director* with articles by William H. Allaway and Stephen P. Koff (1965)
3. *Selection of Participants* by John A. Wallace (1965)
4. *Why Study Abroad?* by Irwin Abrams (1965)
5. *Academic Study Abroad: Its Present Status* by J. Ralph Murray (1965)
6. *National Differences in the Approach to Knowledge* with articles by Joseph A. Lauwerys, Michio Nagai, and Harold Taylor (1967)
7. *Selecting Personnel and Students for Overseas Programs* with articles by Sven Lundstedt and Theodore L. McEvoy (1967)
8. *Teacher Education: The World Dimension* by Frank H. Klassen (1967)
9. *High School Exchange: Does Form Follow Function?* by Norman H. Wilson (1967)
10. *Foreign Study and the Student* with articles by Ruth Useem and George V. Coelho (1967)
11. *The University and International Education* by Robert W. Hartle (1968)
12. *Sending and Receiving Institutions* with articles by Frederico Perez Castro and Enrique Suarez de Puga (1968)
13. *The Selection of American Undergraduate Students for Participation in Study Programs Overseas* by E. Gwen Gardner (1968)
14. *Research in Educational Exchange Problems—Step One: Defining Our Problem* by John E. Bowman (1968)
15. Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs by Allan O. Pfnister (1969)
16. Improving the Educational Quality of Study Abroad Programs by Allan O. Pfnister (1970)
17. *Toward Improved Franco-American University Exchanges* by Roger D. Masters (1971)
18. *Education and the Japan-America Tie in the Mid 70s* by Marius B. Jansen (1974)
19. Advisor's Guide to Study Abroad by Cecelia C. Baumann (1975)
20. *The American Undergraduate, Off-Campus and Overseas: A Study of*

the Educational Validity of Such Programs by W. Frank Hull IV, Walter H. Lemke, Jr., and Richard Ting-ku Houang (1977)

21. *Evaluating Academic Programs Abroad: The CIEE Project* by Irwin Abrams and Francis H. Heller (1978)
22. *Hallmarks of Successful Programs in the Developing World* with articles by William H. Allaway, Joseph W. Elder, Joe K. Fugate, and Diane K. Snell (1987)
23. *International Education: What is It? A Taxonomy of International Education of U.S. Universities* by Stephen Arum (1987)
24. *Educating American Undergraduates Abroad: The Development of Study Abroad Programs by American Colleges and Universities* by John E. Bowman (1987)
25. Hallmarks of Successful International Business Programs with articles by Jeffrey S. Arpan, Marshall Geer, Paul McCracken, and Jerry Wind (1988)
26. The Contribution of International Educational Exchange to the International Education of Americans: Projections for the Year 2000 by Barbara B. Burn (1990)
27. The Travel Journal: An Assessment Tool for Overseas Study by Nancy Taylor (1991)
28. *Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates in Western Europe and the United States* by Jerry S. Carlson, Barbara B. Burn, John Useem, and David Yachimowicz; edited by Elinor G. Barber and Barbara B. Burn (1991)

The Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange are available from:

Council on International Educational Exchange
Publications Department
205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017